Beginning of

The conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees

This title was preceded by

The relation of the mystical to the moral in religious experience

The centrality of the value concept in Christian thought

A study of the religious consciousness

Jesus' conception of his messiahship

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1934 call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.5

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/conflictofjesusw00unse

THE CONFLICT OF JESUS WITH THE PHARISEES

Edward Welton Perry

A.B. Colgate university 1914

Th. B. Auburn Theological Seminary 1925

THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF

NEW TESTAMENT

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SACRED THEOLOGY

IN

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

1934

THE CONFLICT OF JESUS WITH THE PHARISEES

A. INTRODUCTION p.2

History reveals the fact the the Pharisees, the most meticulous in religious teaching and observance among the Jews of Jesus' time, came into conflict with him. This conflict was instrumental in bringing about his death. Both Jesus and the Pharisees were in earnest regarding religious matters. Why did the opposition arise between the Pharisees and Jesus? This is our problem.

B. IDENTIFICATION p.8

I. Who were the Pharisees? Historical account. Their origin, their ideas and their position among the Jews of Jerusalem.
Shown in the Gospels, etc. Shown in other sources.

II. Who was Jesus: a Pharisee? p.13

C. RECORDS of Jesus' Contact with the Pharisees. p.18

Comments and critical material.

D. POINTS of Opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees. p.51

E. SOLUTION for the Problem of the Conflict. p.53

I. Evaluation of Existing Explanations of the Conflict.

Jesus' personal prestige.

Jesus' attitude toward the "tradition of the elders." i.e., the "oral law", the Midrashic interpretations. p.54

Interpretation of the Gospels to favor Romans (form-history theory) etc. p.55

II. The author's solution for the problem. It lies within the mystery of Jesus' personality, which created, as did the earlier Prophets of Israel, a crisis, and allowed of no middle ground for reconciliation. The religious leaders of the Jews must follow him or they must oppose him, it was impossible for them to ignore him. They opposed him, and the result was his death. p.55

F. BIBLIOGRAPHY. p.58

A. INTRODUCTION

"The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not."[1]

Throughout the drama of Jesus' public life there stalks the somber figure of the Pharisee. Pharisee is a name which, rightly or wrongly, has become synonymous with 'formalist', 'hypocritical person', 'self-righteous legalist', 'sanctimonious censor'.[2] Such is the relentless verdict, of popular history at least, on a principal party to the unequal conflict waged nineteen hundred years ago between an unknown Galileean son of a carpenter and what was, in those days, the most vigorous sect of Judaism.[3]

The growth of Christianity from a despised and obscure sect in an obscure corner of the world to the proportions of a world religion, together with the dogged and determined persistence of Judaism throughout a history of varied fortunes including persecution and contempt, make investigation into the nature of conflict an attractive and, we may trust, a profitable task. It was a Jew, in fact a former Pharisee himself, and of the strictest discipline, who cried, out of the depths of his heart, "I can vouch for their zeal for God; only, it is not zeal with knowledge."[4]

Subsequent generations, of nominal Christians at least, have had those among them who were not averse to help on such sorrow as time was to bring to the Jews. The words of the

Psalmist are not irrelevant here. "they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded."[5]

Any worth while investigation into the situation which existed in Palestine at the time of Jesus' ministry and death must take into account the Pharisees' position among the various political and religious parties of the Jews. For such a study we have, unfortunately, little primary material beyond the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament. Josephus, who wrote a Life of Josephus, a History of the Jews and also a book called The Wars of the Jews, lived shortly after the time of Jesus. The references in his works to the Pharisees are slight, compared with the total mass of his writings. But such as they are we have no better extra-biblical material. Rabbi Klausner, in his excellent book, Jesus of Nazareth, a work valuable not only for its depth of insight and breadth of sympathy but also for its painstaking references to Talmudic writings, has this to say regarding the value and scope of Josephus' writings bearing on the subject, "Brief as are his words, they comprise all the views of the Pharisees as they may be perceived in the Mishna and the earliest Talmud Baraitas."[6]

For investigation of the Pharisees' teaching we may explore the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, of which writings R.H. Charles has made the outstanding translation. There are three, or possibly four, writings belonging to this collection which may bear upon the antecedents of the Pharisees and give some indication of their spirit. We shall indicate here briefly their character and date.

The book of Sirach was written about 175 B.C. and is probably of Sadducean origin with Pharisaic influences. There are certain definite resemblances between it and certain sayings of Jesus. Both Jesus and Sirach echo sayings from Canonical Wisdom literature. It proves no connection between Jesus and the Pharisees except some slight common background.[7]

The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, written by a Pharisee about 106-9 B.C., resemble in their ethical principles the Sermon of the Mount, i.e., love to one's neighbor (Israelite) and forgiveness from man to man as a condition upon which God forgives man. Hatred and bitterness are to be banished from one's heart. We can believe that the ethical principles thus stated influenced Jesus, and also possibly certain of the more liberal school of Pharisaic interpretation in his time.[8]

The Psalms of Solomon, c. 50 B.C., are Pharisaic in origin and indicate the spirit of Pharisaic Piety. They are not irenic in tone and Jesus did not echo their sectarian bitterness.[9]

Sometime between A.D. 7 and 29, a Pharisaic Quietist wrote The Assumption of Moses. It is therefore contemporary with Jesus and it divorces political ideals from the Messianic hope, thus agreeing with his point of view.[10]

A third source of information, in regard to Pharisaic teaching, is the Jewish Talmud. Unfortunately, for such a purpose as we have in mind it is seriously defective. To begin with, it appears in the third century A.D. Likewise, it is not entirely translated or indexed in English. There are two sources for it, one Babylonian and the other Palestinian. The construc-

tive use of the Talmud necessitates a comprehensive knowledge of Hebrew, in the first instance, and also an equally comprehensive historical equipment. As a remedy for this technical limitation, we are fortunate in being able to depend upon such a list of scholars in Pharisaic origins and teaching as J.N. Klausner, R.T. Herford, Rabbi Kohler, G.F. Moore, C.G. Montefiori, I. Abrahams and others, whose publications, consulted in this paper, are indicated in the Bibliography. We shall only here indicate such general verdict as is found in two or three particular quotations.

Judaism, as it became after Jesus' time and has continued until this day, is by consent of the best authorities, Pharisaism.[11]

"A few clear-cut statements in the Talmud might have dispensed with many guesses. But history was not the province of Rabbinic literature. Where we look in vain for information on the Maccabees, on the schools of Hillel and Shammai, or on a Bar Cochba, we can hardly expect to find a clear account of the central figure of an antagonistic religion."[12]

"We shall not solve even this problem of Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom of God, which so self-evidently requires Josephus and the apocalypses and the materials which Strack-Billerbeck have gathered for its historical study, by any merely external use of them."[13]

Great caution is necessary in using Talmudic material for the purpose of finding Pharisaic origins. Both Jewish as well as Christian scholars, says Klausner, have erred, when writing

on the times of Jesus, in that, "they make no distinction between the really ancient sources for Pharisaism and those which are relatively late."[14]

On the constructive side, it is important to quote in full here a statement of Klausner's which bears upon the originality of form in Jesus' teaching. "With Geiger and Graetz, we can aver, without laying ourselves open to the charge of subjectivity and without any desire to argue in defence of Judaism, that throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which can not be paralleled either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus."[15]

Of supreme importance therefore is the experience of Jesus himself as we have it recorded, the content of his teaching about God and man, and his conception of his own position and duty.[16] And here it is necessary to remind ourselves that the form-history method of historical criticism, which D.W. Riddle has made use of in his Jesus and the Pharisees to defend the character of the Pharisees of Jesus' time, is at best a two-edged sword. Being an inferential method of circumstantial investigation it reveals quite as much of its user's predilections, as of objective truth. It is not impossible that Luke's Gospel, and Acts tend to favor the Romans, but it is not proved thereby that the Pharisees were innocent of guilt in the matter of Jesus' death, or that they were right and he wrong in the mutual struggle.[17]

NOTES on A. INTRODUCTION

1 Mt 23:2,3.

2 Prac. Standard Dictionary, 1924, p.850.

3 JAJ pp. 394, 403,544, 629. LJ p.20.

4 Rom 10:2 (Moffatt).

5 Ps 69:26

6 JNK p.212.

7 APC vol.1, p. 238f.

8 APC vol.2, pp.282-290, Test. of Dan 2:2 "For anger is blindness, and does not suffer one to see the face of any man with truth." Test. of Gad 6:3 "Love ye, therefore, one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, cast out the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile, and if he confess and repent, forgive him." These parallel Lk 17:3 and Mt 18:15. ABC p.198, art. "The Literature of the Interestamental Period," L.E. Fuller.

9 APC vol.2, pp.627-629. ABC ibid. p.197.

10 JBL vol.48 ('29) p.8 "Primitive Christianity and Judaism: A Symposium," "The Problem of things New and Old in the Beginnings of Christianity," Frank C. Porter.

11 HDB p.719, art. "Pharisees"; ERE vol.9, pp.831-836, art. "Pharisees", G.H. Box; DCG vol.2, pp.351f, art. "Pharisees". In this case note quotation therein from Bousset "Jesu Predigt", 182, p. 32; PH p.52, particularly valuable.

12 JBL vol.48, pp.82-108 ('29) art. by Sam S. Cohen.

13 JBL op.cit. vol.48, p.10f., F.C. Porter.

14 JNK p.120ff.

15 JNK p.384ff. Note herewith a long list of parallelisms between various Talmudic sayings and those contained in Gospels.

16 JBL vol.48 op.cit. p.10; also vol.47, pp.32f., "Jesus'Attitude to the Law of Moses," Harvie Branscomb.

17 "The Pharisees", R.T. Herford pp.14, 114; JNK pp.42-43.

B. IDENTIFICATION

I. Historical account of the Pharisees.

There is no authentic "History of the Pharisees" to which we may refer by chapter and verse to identify them. The Pharisees draw our attention because they "form the background of the Gospels."[1] The best historical localization of them, as a party among the Jews, would place their time of greatest importance between the two great periods of Jewish wars; that of the Maccabees, in the second century B.C., and that of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish sacrificial system, in the last part of the first Christian century.[2] Previous to the time of the Maccabees, there were two parties among the Jews; the Hasidim, Assideans, ("the pious" or "the saints"), and the Hellenists.[3] The Pharisees are first mentioned by Josephus in connection with Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabeus;[4] and under John Hyrcanus they opposed the Sadducees.[5]

All authorities indicate that it is difficult to state more than this, as to their antecedents. A somewhat stereotyped and too factual view, possibly in general with much truth to it, is expressed by Rabbi Kohler. The introduction of the Book of the Law of Moses by Ezra the Scribe was the actual origin of Pharisaism. The Scribes continued the practice of reading and teaching the scripture.[6]

The name Pharisee is allied to the Hebrew word parash and this connotes the idea of 'separate' or 'separation'. To or from what this separation is related is not clear. It may have been from people ceremonially less clean, or it may have been from

Gentiles in general. It may have related to "the Assideans who separated themselves from Judas Maccabeus when freedom of religion was achieved and a legitimate high priest succeeded Menelaus."[7]

By the beginning of the first century B.C., if not earlier, the Pharisees had attained a position of leadership and influence, and this they maintained until the destruction of the Jewish state. Their power and prestige is evident from the most cursory reading of the New Testament.

When we come to the matter of the ideas which the Pharisees held with such tenacity, both religious and national convictions, we are on more definite ground. The Pharisees were determined nationalists. The struggle of the Jews against Hellenization at the hands of the Seleucid king, Antiochus Epiphanes, during the middle of the second century B.C. left the Pharisees, as opposed to the Sadducees, the champions of complete elimination and exclusion of all foreign influence. In matters of religion they, as well as the Sadducees, valued the written Torah and their Scribes expounded it. But the Pharisees added to it what is called the 'oral law'. Out of this grew the Mishna, interpretation, and the Halakah, legal decision. In this, again, they were opposed to the Sadducees, as they were in their strict nationalizing tendencies.

"The Pharisees, as contrasted with the Sadducees, represented the democratic tendency. As contrasted with the priesthood, they stood both for the democratic and for the spiritualizing tendency."[8] They were churchmen, not statesmen, and preaching and teaching was their principle function. The author of the article just referred to declares that it was their

freedom from sacerdotal leanings that caused the New Testament to be devoid of ritualism.

In theology, the Pharisees were strongly monotheistic as were all Jews. They were not 'other worldly' as a class, but were interested in bringing, "the sanctions of religion into this life." Their "Messiah was a purely human son of David."[9] Their object was to live according to the Law. The following quotation is valuable.

"Their religious position was fully in accord with orthodox Judaism. In contradistinction from the Sadducees, the Pharisees insisted on the validity of a mass of oral tradition (Mt 15:2; Mk 7:3) which had accumulated in the course of centuries as a supplement to the written law. The Pharisees held this to be as binding as the law itself (San. 11:3). But "the Sadducees rejected all such oral traditions and held strictly to the written Mosaic ordinances (JAJ 13:10:6)."[10]

Turning to Josephus, we find definite statements as to the types of Pharisaism evident in what we know to be Jesus' time in Jerusalem, as follows: "the sect of the Pharisees, which are supposed to excell others in the accurate knowledge of the laws of their country."[11] One of three sects, with the Sadducees and Essenes, among the Jews.[12] Same described as having "so great a power over the multitude that when they say a thing against the king, or against the high priest, they are presently believed."[13] Also, "they have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses. --they have

the multitude on their side."[14] They are "revengeful". They opposed the government (Kings) and were a "cunning sect", and "easily aroused into active opposition". They were virtuous in conduct and able to persuade the body of the people by action and discourse. "They are a certain sect of the Jews that appear more religious than others, and seem to interpret the laws more accurately." They "governed" Queen Alexandra and revenged themselves on their enemies.[15]

The Pharisees differed from the Herodians (and Sadducees) in their earnestness in the matters of religion. Likewise they did not use appeal to force, as the Zealots did, for there was a strong right wing of the Pharisaic party consisting of the Essenes, who were quietists.[16] The Pharisees were strongly missionary as is evidenced in their desire to proselytize. It is probable that in Jesus' time they were stronger in Galilee and the north of Palestine than in Judea, which was under control of the less nationalistic Sadduceean priesthood.

S.S. Cohon, in the article referred to above (p. 5, note 2), believes that the Talmud (Jer. Sab.1:4) indicates the newness of the "tradition of the Elders" in Jesus' day as, according to the reference indicated, the rule of handwashing before meals was established by Shammai and Hillel. (Also note Erubim IV:1)

On the subject of the Pharisees and the 'Amme ha-aretz we have a definite point of view also revealed by Cohon and it should be indicated here for what it is worth. "The use of 'am ha-aretz as synonymous with bor is due to the sense which the term acquired in later centuries,--." "Rabbinic literature

still retains the difference between 'am ha-aretz and bor." (Abot. II:5) We are not justified, by the evidence at our disposal, in considering them as the poor and dispossessed. "Among them we find the entire body of the publicans and other men of influence. They probably included the whole Sadduceean aristocracy." The barrier between them and the Pharisees was the divergent attitude toward the "tradition of the Elders", and these were Pharisaic innovations. This definition makes all non-Pharisees in Jesus' time 'amme ha-aretz.

Gospel sources indicate several definite facts about the position of the Pharisees in Jesus' time which we shall indicate here:

They were associated with "doctors of the law" (teachers of the Jewish religion), and with the "scribes", Lk 5:17, 21, 30; Mt 15:1; Mk 7:1.

They were teachers, as were the "Sadducees", Mt 16:6; Mk 3:15; 12:13,17.

They could be on common terms with the Herodians, Mk 3:6.

They stood in a peculiar position in regard to the Mosaic Law, which, evidently, from this statement, they together with the scribes interpreted and enforced. Mt 23:1-12; 16-22; 23, 24.

They were a missionary body seeking the extension of Judaism. Mt 23:15.

They built upon the prophetic religious traditions of Israel. Mt 23:29f.

According to the Fourth Gospel, they collaborated with

the high priests, Jn 7:32, and belonged to the "authotities", vs. 50; 11:59.

They evidently helped to make up the Sanhedrin. Jn 11: 46, 47.

They constituted some kind of a court of authority in matters of purification. Jn 9:13.

They constituted a "party" among the Jews, based on religious interpretations (of the Law). Acts 15:5; 23:28.

Some of them belonged to the Sanhedrin. Acts 5:34ff.; 23:6ff.

They were strict in interpretation of religious duty, and distinctive as adherents of a certain "interpretation" of the (Mosaic) law. Acts 26:5 and Phil. 3:5.

B. IDENTIFICATION (continued)

II. Who was Jesus: a Pharisee?

This matter needs some attention, for there is a divergence of opinion regarding it. It may be said with certainty that Jesus never allied himself with any Jewish party or sect. The "temptation" parable is absolute proof of this fact. The Zealotist radicals, whom he knew from his Galileean experience, held no attraction for him. The austere and pietistic Essenes were too 'other-worldly' to offer fellowship for a man who "ate and drank with publicans and sinners". "To the Moderate Pharisaic center, too, Jesus stands in sharpest antagonism. The exact nature of this antagonism is not easy to discern through the fog of bitter hostility which fills the Gospels toward the

Pharisees, who proved to be the strongest opponents of the claims of the early Church. Luke retains traditions of friendly relations between Jesus and the Pharisees. He dines at Pharisees' homes and is warned by Pharisees when Herod intends to slay him.[17] While we are not convinced of the prejudice which this author finds in the attitude of New Testament writers, still his point of view as given above is worth recording, for Riddle comes to exactly the opposite conclusion in his book, Jesus and the Pharisees, and considers Luke and Acts worthless for any fair consideration of the Pharisees.[18]

But even if Jesus failed to ally himself with any sect of his time, we have indications that his methods were somewhat like those of the teacher and scribe. Jesus agreed with the Pharisees on the Unity of God, on the sanctity of the Temple and on the divine authority of the written Torah, on Retribution and on the Resurrection. "The prayer which he is said to have taught his disciples bears close resemblance to the prayers current in Pharisaic circles."[19] He used texts and proverbs and parables. The Midrash and Talmud reveal the same form, that of Rabbinic teachers.[20] But this only proves the well known fact that all oriental teaching takes this graphic and pictorial form.

Klausner considers that Jesus was in many respects like a Pharisee of the Hillel type. "On the whole, Jesus rather favored the political-spiritual messianism of the Pharisees despite its lack of mysticism and its being too much "of this world" for his liking during the later period of his career, when his "kingdom" became definitely "not of this world". Likewise, "Jesus,

in the Caparnaum synagogue, read from the Prophets and expounded, and so conducted himself like a Scribe or Pharisee and was so regarded as such by the people." His divergence from Pharisaic teaching might, at first, have seemed "only a case of one Pharisee differing from others in certain details, just as a follower of the Shammai School differed from the Hillel School."[21]

Evidently Jesus observed the ceremonial laws to the end of his life. In his debate with the Pharisees over his authority for doing miracles of casting out demons, he implies that the Pharisees also practiced the same thing. Even in his castigation of the Pharisees, Jesus "did not stand alone, as an oft repeated statement in the Talmud (Sota 22a.b. etc.) charges five classes out of seven of the Pharisees with being hypocrites."[22] The Talmud also condemns "those who require what is good but do not practise it." (Hagiga 14a.; Yebamoth 63b.) Likewise, "Seemly are the words when they come from the mouth of them which practise them; some there be which require what is good and also practise it: Ben Azzai requires what is good but does not practise it." (T. Yebamoth viii 4)[23]

Likewise, Jesus did not meddle in politics nor did he incite revolt against Herod. In this he was like the Pharisees, who were contented with freedom to study and practise the law and to enforce the same among their countrymen.[24] More than this, the Synagogue as an institution, with its democratic liberties, was congenial alike to the Pharisees and to Jesus. And it was "the organized embodiment of the religion of the Torah."[25]

More than this we have no right to aver. We cannot say that Jesus ever belonged to the "sect" of the Pharisees. That

they had many things in common in their respective views of God and of man is plainly evident. That they took religion seriously is also plain. We may even say with a measure of certainty that upon first acquaintance, Jesus might have appeared to some, who did not know him well, to be a Pharisee teacher or scribe of the more lenient Hillel type. Jesus could never have said, as did St. Paul, that he belonged to the strictest type of his co-religionists and endeavored to excell in that direction. To this it may be added that the Pharisees, according to our records, never claimed him as one of them.

NOTES on B. IDENTIFICATION

1 Ph p.11f.

2 ERE vol. ix, p.831. art. "Pharisees", G.H. Box

3 JNK p.202.

4 JAJ vol. xiii.5.#9.

5 PH p.29.

6 OSCK p.134f.; DCG vol.2, p.351.

7 JM vol.1, pp.60,61. (For definition 'seceeders' see T.B. Pes. 706)

8 HDB art. "Pharisees", H.S. Nash, pp.719-720.

9 ERE vol.ix, p.836, art. by G.H. Box.

10 EB vol.iv, art. "Scribes and Pharisees", J.D. Prince, 4323.

11 LJ p.20.

12 JAJ p.394.

13 JAJ p.403.

14 JAJ p. 403

15 ibid. pp.412,517,544; JWJ p.629.

16 JBL vol.48 op.cit.; JNK pp.171,201.

17 JBL vol.48 op.cit. p.93.

18 JPR chap.v.

19 JBL vol.48 op.cit. pp.94f.

20 JBL ibid. pp.95-98.

21 JNK pp.202,263,264.

22 OSCK pp.225,226.

23 JNK p.366

24 JM p.77.

25 PH pp.88,101,104.

C. RECORDS of Jesus' contact with the Pharisees.

We make use here of Burton and Goodspeed whose line by line Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels affords the best comparison in English that is available. With these references are associated the few on the same subject from the Fourth Gospel. In detailed references which follow it is obviously impossible to include every statement in the Gospels which may have a bearing upon Jesus' teaching and life as opposed to that of the Pharisees. We shall try to indicate each situation wherein the Pharisees are explicitly referred to, or are obviously indicated. Since the absolute chronological arrangement of Jesus' life and teachings is obviously impossible, as well as unimportant, for students to ascertain, we shall adhere to the order followed in the Harmony mentioned above.

(1) The incident of the man healed of "an unclean spirit" in the Capernaum synagogue on a "sabbath day". (Mt 8:14-17; Mk 1; 21-34; Lk 4:31-41). Jesus is here referred to "with authority" in his teaching, "and not as the scribes". While Pharisees are not here specifically indicated, the scribes, teachers and expounders of the law, may well have been such, particularly so inasmuch as this incident took place not in Jerusalem, the seat of the priestly authority, but in Galilee. Klausner thinks that "it seemed at first only a case of one Pharisee differing from others in certain details, just as a follower of the Shammai School differed from a follower of the Hillel School. The same thing happened to Jesus at the beginning of his career as happened to Socrates at the end of his career: Socrates who had

fought against the Sophists was, in the end, condemned to death as a Sophist; and Jesus, who fought against the Pharisees, was at the outset of his career regarded as a Pharisee in every respect."[1] The real point of difference between Jesus and the scribes was that they taught nothing of themselves but based what they said upon Scripture entirely, while Jesus spoke from his heart without constant reference to Scripture. It is also Klausner's suggestion that this characterization may refer to Jesus' use of parable. But I scarcely think this is borne out by the fact, unless it be in the way, the aptness and vigor, with which he chose and used his pictures. Herford's note on this passage is also worth our attention.[2] "The ultimate authority is, of course, in every case, that of God himself, however it may be apprehended. It was so for the Pharisees, no less for Jesus; but, while for them it was apprehended through the Torah, and its injunctions, defined by intellectual process, and moral discernment, derived their binding force in fact from human enactment, by him the authority of God was owned and felt in immediate experience." It was a point of difference that allowed no compromise and Jesus, having appeared, was bound to come into conflict with the Pharisees and scribes unless he abandoned public life altogether.

We must note, however, that this estimation of Jesus and his teaching is made by people not primarily concerned as to what process intervened by which Jesus got his authority. His effect upon people was the important thing. The Pharisees had no such vivid effect. This reveals the futility of their system

and methods.

(2) The healing of a paralytic. (Mt 9:1-8; Mk 2:1-12; Lk 5: 17-26) Luke indicates "Pharisees and doctors of the law" as well as "scribes", while Matthew and Mark confine it to "scribes". Jesus is accused of blasphemy because he assumes authority to forgive sins. This is, Montefiore notes,[3] the only place in the Synoptic Gospels except Lk 7:47 (and parallels) where Jesus claims to forgive sins. Upon the matter of Luke's definite inclusion of the Pharisees, Riddle[4] thinks that he here heightens Jesus' judgement of them by the use of the phrase "Pharisees and doctors of the law". There seems to be real reason for thinking that Luke's narrative is influenced by his lack of knowledge as to actual Palestinian conditions, for he makes Peter's (possibly) house have a tile roof; as would a Roman villa. But this does not convince all critics that the inclusion of the Pharisees here is unauthentic, for Klausner[5] says that Jesus, "once told a paralytic man that his sins were forgiven (obviously owing to his sufferings, since "suffering cleans a man from all his sins", Berachoth 5a), and this was, by the Pharisees, looked upon as blasphemy, "for who can forgive sins but God alone?". I am not impressed with the argument that Luke is unjust to the Pharisees. This is just such a point as would naturally cause their strictures upon Jesus' methods.

Herford notes[6] here, "that Jesus, though he said hard things about the Pharisees, never said anything against the

synagogue--."

(3) Jesus at the house of the publican, Levi. (Mk 2:15-17; Mt 9:10-13; Lk 5:29-32.) Matthew mentions scribes while Mark includes Pharisees, as does Luke, identifying them with their scribes. Jesus is rebuked, through his disciples, for associating with "publicans and sinners". It is curious that the stricture on Jesus' conduct is made not to him directly, but to "his disciples". This may support Klausner's statement that, "Jesus was himself regarded as a Pharisee, so what had he to do with publicans and robbers and ignorant sinners?" Consequently, other Pharisees might feel some reluctance in openly and directly criticising another of their sect. On the matter of the reprobation of tax-gatherers, this reference is worth our quotation.[7] "It was, apparently from that time--that of the Romans and their agent Herod--that the name 'publican' became synonymous with robber, brigand, ruffian, murderer, and reprobate; one whose evidence was invalid, whose money could not be accepted as alms for the poor nor used in exchange, since it was suspected of having been acquired by robbery. (Sanh. 25b; B.Qama xi)" "In this the Gospels are in complete agreement with the Talmud and the collacation 'publicans and sinners' commonly occurs." The same idea is expressed in T.B. Sukkah 49b. and also by J. Ben Zakai, who was a contemporary of St. Paul, as is indicated in verse 13 of Matthew's account, according to Abrahams,[8] while Montefiori rather justifies the Pharisaic attitude, for with the Rabbis, "the law of God came first. God came be-

fore themselves, and even before their neighbour". Jesus "was condemned and hated because he violated the letter of the Law and justified the violation".[9] This incident, for Riddle[10] is another evidence of the 'unsympathetic" attitude of the synopticists toward the Pharisees.

There does not seem to us to be anything untrustworthy or suspicious about this direct and self-evident narrative. It shows Jesus looking on human need, both for sympathy and companionship as well as for material aid, as the primary object when compared with ceremonial or legal restrictions. It is entirely in character, both in regard to the Pharisees and in relation to Jesus. It is a fine example of the totally different point of view of the two in the matter of religious privilege and duty.

(4) The "disciples of John" are here associated with the "disciples of the Pharisees" and they secure a statement in parabolic form from Jesus which reflects upon the value of Pharisaic customs and teaching. (Mt 9:14-17; and Mk 2:18-22 associate John's disciples and those of the Pharisees. Lk 5:33-39 simply says "they" as the author of the question, but in the query concurs in associating both classes of disciples as contrasted with those of Jesus.) Montefiori and Riddle here agree in making the Pharisees extraneous to the original situation and account, and belonging to a later tradition.[11] Unfortunately for their case, Klausner considers this to be a place where Jesus' defence, Mk 2:19, "is entirely in accord with the Pharisaic ruling:

"The companions of the bridegroom and all the 'children of the bridechamber' are exempt from the obligation of prayer and the use of phylacteries (still more fasting) during the seven days (of the wedding feast)." R. Shila (an individual opinion) held: "The bridegroom is exempt but not the children of the bridechamber". (T. Berachoth II 10; Berechoth 11a, 16a; Sukkah 25b-26a; J. Sukkah 115)[12]

The same point of view is upheld by Abrahams. "All three synoptics (Mk 2:18; Mt 9:14; Lk 5:33) represent the disciples of John as associated with the Pharisees in fasting. Thus just as Josephus assures us that the Pharisees were not opponents of the Essenes (as they were of the Sadducees) so there was no violent division between John and the Pharisees; the assumption that the Jews rejected John belongs to a later conception that John was forerunner of Jesus."[13]

However the original question may have come about, there seems to us to be no doubt that Jesus pronounced, in parabolic form, a penetrating judgement on the relative value of his point of view and that of the scribes, and it is quite understandable that the Pharisees were associated with, and agreeable to, the scribal opinions.

(5) On the occasion of Jesus' disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath (Mt 12:1-8; Mk 2:23-28; Lk 6:1-5) the only variation in the story is in Luke's account, who says, "certain of the Pharisees". Riddle, true to his thesis, considers the relation between Jesus and the Pharisees "unsympathetic" but it is interest-

ing to note the restriction in Luke.[14] We find that a Tannaim, R. Jonathan b. Yoseph, says, "The Sabbath was given into your hand, and ye were not given into its hand." (Yoma 6; Yoma 85b; Yoma VIII 5) and R. Shimeon b. Menassia says, "The Sabbath is delivered to you, and ye not delivered to the Sabbath". (Mechelta, Ki 1).[15] Here it seems as though Jesus used a perfectly legitimate method of defence, practiced also by the Pharisees. I can see no "strained analogy",[16] nor that Jesus "asserted a general right to abrogate the Sabbath law for man's convenience, while the Rabbis limited the license to cases of danger to life."[17] Klausner says here that "In practical manner of life, Jesus also conducted himself like a Pharisee--", and justified his actions as the Pharisees did, by a fortiori argument.[18] We need not dwell upon this, except to say that it was a public argument wherein Jesus gained his point and the Pharisees lost face. Just such an incident as would be remembered of any teacher in any oriental country today.

The "Son of Man" statement is not clear as to meaning. The Aramaic form means simply "man". It is possible that the Messianic form was given to this by the evangelist. Gore, in his comment on this verse,[19] says, "Here again it is gratuitous to suggest that our Lord did not refer to Himself as Son of Man, but meant only that 'a man' or 'mankind' is Lord of the Sabbath. There is no example in the Gospels of His recognizing in men generally a right to ignore a divine ordinance, such as He recognized the Sabbath to be." I do not consider that Jesus believed himself to be a divine annotater of the Mosaic law. It takes

nothing from his essential divinity to affirm that here he simply enunciated a universal truth inherent in prophetic religion.

(6) "The scribes and the Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the Sabbath," (Lk 6:7) "the Pharisees went out and (straightway with the Herodians, Mk) took counsel against him, how they might destroy him." (Mt 12:14; Mk 3:6), (Mt 12:9-14; Mk 3:1-6; Lk 6:6-11) (cp. John 5:10,16).

This event takes place in a synagogue. It was not a case of "saving a life" as far as we know. So it may be asserted, with extenuation of the Pharisees' attitude, that they were indignant inasmuch as he healed on the Sabbath, regardless of the nature of the illness.[20] The responsibility for his death is placed by all three Evangelists upon the Pharisees, representatives of orthodox, legal Judaism, together with the Herodians, people who were suspicious of every one who might be 'agin the government', i.e., against Herod's house. Wellhausen notes that, "government men, like Herod, were afraid of every movement." These Herodians are by inference adherents of Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee. It is not surprising that the opposition to Jesus, resulting in his death, should have started in Galilee and been carried to Jerusalem, but it seems to us to indicate a collusion between purely religious and secular interests. It is not indicated that the "Herodians" had any objection to Jesus' healing in synagogue or on Sabbath. Evidently, there were two sources of enmity and opposition, and neither party boggled at making stock of the other's hatred.

(7) The only explicit reference, in the Sermon on the Mount, that mentions the Pharisees (and scribes) is found in Mt 5:20. Hypocrites are mentioned (Mt 6:5,16) and at the end of the collection of sayings (Mt 7:29) a comparison adverse to the force of the scribes is appended. There is no sufficient reason for believing this 'sermon' to be all of one piece and delivered at one time. Various critics cast doubt upon the authenticity of Jesus' words regarding the scribes and Pharisees, some believing that they are apocalyptic. Ardent defenders of Pharisaism make this a misrepresentation of actual Jewish behaviour. Unfortunately, a sense of humor seems to be lacking in the critical apparatus of some writers. Riddle, in order to prove the picture unfaithful to facts, notes that the elder Lightfoot hunted long and carefully, and without success, to discover any indication of trumpets having been sounded before the hypocrites! Evidently literallism is not confined to fundamentalists.

If one makes Jesus a second Moses, no satisfactory solution can be arrived at. It seems to us that Jesus exposed the weak element in formal Jewish religion. It was a different type of righteousness that Jesus was after, and the Pharisees most certainly leaned toward the legalistic interpretation. Montefiori thinks that Jesus had no "deliberate intention of teaching a new religion or a new 'righteousness'." "He was well content with Micah's What doth the Lord desire of thee," etc., and with the love of God and one's neighbor.[21] It appears to us that it was just in this matter that Pharisaic and scribal religion fell down, and Jesus put his finger upon the sore spot.

There is no sufficient evidence upon which to pronounce these words either unauthentic or apocalyptic, except to serve a theory. The collection and arrangement is another matter, upon which there is as yet insufficient data. There is no evidence of injustice toward the Pharisees.[22]

(8) Luke (7:36-50) includes an incident taking place at a "Pharisees's house" where Jesus rebukes his host. I cannot see the cloven hoof of Luke's lack of sympathy, as does Klausner (p. 312). On the contrary, the whole story is beautiful and the rebuke, if this is the word to use, most gently put. No picture of Jesus in his dealing with people is more attractive. He is evidently upon good terms with the Pharisee, and the rebuke might never have been uttered had not the woman presented herself. Luke notes other places (11:37; 14:1; 19:5) where Jesus is on good enough terms with both Pharisee and publican to eat with them. Unless we are to act upon the theory that every incident revealing the Pharisee in an unfavorable light is untrustworthy, we must receive this account as characteristic and revealing.

(9)(10) The situation described in Mt 12:22-45 (9:32-34) and the parallels (Mk 3:19b-30 as well as certain verses in Lk 11: 6, 12) must be a composite, as is the longer sermon found earlier in Matthew. (Note the gloss or comment on Mt 12:39.) The Pharisees are mentioned in Mt 12:24 (9:34,38). Note John 6:30. If the occasion was at the Feast of the Tabernacles, during

which the Jewish liturgy referred to Moses in the wilderness, the question about a sign would be evidently in order. Evidently, miracle was one of the privileges of the Pharisees, for Jesus refers to that, in connection with the casting out of demons. Surely, the imputation of evil to the worker of a miracle of healing is evidence of a warped and churlish spirit.

The recurrence, after verse 42 in Matthew's account, to the original theme of demon possession expands the condemnation to the whole 'generation' and cannot be restricted to the Pharisees. There is a harking back, in the condemnation of verse 34, to chapter 3:7 where it is put into the mouth of John the Baptist. Plainly, here is a case difficult to untangle. It certainly contains a condemnation of some Pharisees, but even Luke, who is supposed by some to be particularly anti-Pharisaic, does not mention them in the parallels. We can deduce nothing further than the above with certainty.

(11) Following the general arrangement made use of by Burton and Goodspeed, and still in what is called the Galilean Ministry of Jesus, we have the altercation between Jesus and the Pharisees (together with the scribes) over the matter of ceremonial defilement (Mt 15:1-20; Mk 6:1-23. Luke has no parallel here, except a fragment at the end of the sixth chapter relative to "the blind leading the blind", vs. 39.) This is an important passage and indicates a definite point of cleavage. Upon this matter indicated in Mark's editorial passage (vs.3,5)

Jewish writers are inclined to restrict the hand-washing necessity to Priests of the temple. I wish to call particular attention to two excellent short commentaries, on this passage, which are found in the New Commentary on Holy Scripture.[23] It is impossible to deal fully with this matter here. Mark's statement in verse three "does not square with what comes to us from Rabbinic sources--." This, also, Klausner notes.[24] The whole passage is composite and contains some, how much we do not know, of editorial material; i.e., Mt 15:20b. Montefiori hopes that Mk 7:9-13 is unauthentic.

There are two definite statements which we can make as to Jesus' positive attitude which resulted in widening the break between himself and the Pharisees. He spiked for all time the ancient taboo of ceremonial uncleanness of the body, just such a thing as any really prophetic teacher could be expected to strike. And he accomplished it by putting his finger, again, upon the wretched 'corban' prerogative evidently made use of in his time to some extent. This saying over something "Korban" did not thereby devote it to the temple or to any useful purpose, but simply broke the commandment implying duty to support parents. That this is so is proven easily by reference to Neandrim, iv 8 and vi 4, where definite methods are indicated whereby a son, who regrets the appeal to the stringent "Korban" regulation, may, by first giving something to a neighbor, succeed in getting it, by that roundabout way, into the hands of his parents without breaking his vow. It may be humiliating to defenders of the Pharisees to admit this fright-

ful elevation of "Catholic custom" (see NCHS in. loc.) "to the position of a supreme and binding authority." But in this, as in many other places, Jesus' insight and relentless moral logic cannot be escaped. It is no wonder that the scribes and Pharisees writhed under the sting of rebuke.

Bacon (The Beginnings of the Gospel Story, xxiv) as well as Riddle, and others, think that there is much Hellenistic editorial in the lists of sins (Mt 15:18ff. & Mk 7:20ff.) We do not believe that this can be asserted beyond vs. 22 in Mark's account. (cp. Gal. 5:19ff., Rom. 1:29ff.) The epithet "hypocrite" is used here first. Moore asserts that "The first allusion to the rule (of washing) being made obligatory upon laymen is hardly earlier than the age of Rabbi Akiba--i.e., c.A.D. 100."[25] But this does not warrant the inference that the evidence is contrary to Mark's editorial note, vs.3,4.[26]

(12) Another demand on the part of the Pharisees (Sadducces included by Matthew) for a sign from heaven, with a subsequent sharp statement and warning against them by Jesus, is recorded for us. (Mt 16:1-12; Mk 8:11-21; together with parallel material gathered from Luke's Gospel, 11th and 12th chapters.) We need not dwell upon this more than to indicate a Talmudic expression (Berachoth 17a): "Who is the thwarter? the leaven that is in the dough and the servitude inflicted by the Gentile powers." (Herod? Mk 8:15) Mark's account presents difficulties in its reference, vs.20, to a second feeding of the multitude, but this does not concern us here. There is no warrant for the

suggestion that the public for which Matthew wrote, supposedly Antioch Christians, considered the Pharisees hypocrites and so he incorporated their prejudices into this account, for, Matthew includes Sadducees, and Mark extends the warning to Herod,while it is Luke, in a passage that may be entirely independent, who uses the word "hypocrisy."

(13) We note here, in passing, the prediction (Mk 8:31; Mt 16: 21; Lk 9:22) on the part of Jesus that "elders", "chief priests" and "scribes" would reject him in Jerusalem, and that he would be killed. No mention is made here of Pharisees, unless by implication, even in Luke's Gospel. (In Mt 17 and parallels it simply says "The son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men; etc." No qualifying adjectives.)

(14) We pass, according to the Harmony we are following, into what is called the Perean ministry. Harmonistic methods are responsible for this identification, and the account has been questioned as to its factuality. We cannot deal with that question here, but simply note that the account of the casting out of demons, treated in our section #10 above wherein Lukan material is used as a parallel to what is purported to take place in Galilee, is now used as a parallel by Goodspeed and Burton for what is purported to take place "beyond the Jordan." (Mt 9:32ff. and parallels.)

(15) We have in Luke 11:37-44 a story of Jesus at a meal in a

Pharisee's house at which occasion there is a criticism of Jesus by the Pharisee and a defence of his own actions by Jesus, and this involves a characterization of Pharisaic methods. There can be nothing suspicious about this account, except perhaps its location by Luke in the "Perean ministry".

(16) The rebuke of the lawyers in Luke 11:45-54 also falls in the same category as the above section, Matthew's parallel is in 23:29ff. There is no parallel for Luke 11:53, where the 'scribes and Pharisees' attack him with definite purpose.

(17) Luke 12:1-12, Perean ministry, is paralleled by material in Matthew 10, 12, and 16, indicated above, as is also the same material in Mark 8, and has been dealt with above, as far as the "leaven of the Pharisees" is concerned.

(18) In Luke 13:31-35 we have a section part of which (31-33) has no Gospel parallel. The remainder of the passage recurrs in Matthew 23:37-39. In contradistinction to Mark 3:6, the Pharisees here evidently are not evil disposed toward Jesus. With all the various exceptions in view, it is impossible to maintain that Luke is prejudiced against them.

(19) We have here again an incident evidently peculiar to Luke. (14:1-24.) Fragmentary parallels are found in Matthew 12:23; and Mark 3. We cannot extract from this occasion any violent opposition to the Pharisees. Even Riddle has to admit

that this is an "exception".

(20) The Parable of the Prodigal Son, together with the other two lesser ones, in the fifteenth chapter of Luke is most evidently told with the Pharisees in mind. In fact they are mentioned in verse two, together with the scribes. There is a small amount of parallel material in Matthew eighteen. This magnificent and tender parable, together with the following one in Luke sixteen, verses one to thirteen, are a most gentle rebuke. Nothing could be more delicate, nor more merciful in the mildness of its reproof. Yet the point is made with complete success.

(21) Again we have, in Luke 16:14-18, an editorial collection of sayings of Jesus prefaced by the writer's pronouncement upon the Pharisees. The sequence and connection is plainly with the parable in the first part of the chapter. It is not clear that this phrase, "lovers of money", is valid. The scribes are spoken of in Mark 12:40 as "devourers of widow's houses" and this, again, is unexplained. We would be inclined to agree here with the assumption that Jewish (Pharisaic) persecution of Christians had elicited this inference from the parable of the Unjust Steward.

(22) The phrase, used by Jesus in speaking to the Pharisees, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation:--The kingdom of God is within you", is a source of endless conjecture. The

Greek preposition, "entos", can be rendered with equal facility, either "in the midst of you" or "within you". The teaching of the whole passage is that the kingdom of God is a spiritual thing, in the heart of man. Jesus was stating a universal religious truth: that religion, to be effective outwardly, must first be a thing of sincerety within the soul. The Pharisees had the same opportunity as other men of proving the reality of this.

The total passage (Lk 17:20; 18:8), together with fragmentary parallels (from Mt chaps. 24 & 16 as well as Mk 8 & 13) bear unmistakable signs of editing and there is apocalyptic material from Q intermixed with Luke's own material. The point we are making is that this passage cannot be interpreted to reveal prejudice against the Pharisees. In fact, it may be an unmistakable sign that Jesus saw in them the possibility of insight into his true significance. We may note that one of the Oxyrhynchus fragments bears out the "within you" translation. Dr. Abrahams [27b] takes the opposite view, that of "in the midst of you."

(23) The parable of the Pharisee and the Publican has no parallel except a possible fragment (Mt 23:12). Here the defenders of the Pharisees have rallied to the charge with evidence to show that Luke's Pharisee is an exceptional one. Talmudic material, they say, reveals the teaching of equality of man before God. Likewise, the Publican's prayer is essentially Pharisaic, in fact, he actually used a Pharisaic liturgical form.

(Berachoth 17a, also 34b. Midrash, Levit R. vii 2 & Tehillim xviii 2) "Broken vessels are a disgrace for a man to use, but God loves the broken heart." Likewise, the Code (Shulhan Aruch, O.H. 565,566): "He who fasts and makes a display of himself to others, to boast of his fasting, is punished for this."

We cannot say that here Jesus deliberately characterized all Pharisees as ostentatious hypocrites. He simply told a parable, in which ostentation in religion was compared unfavorably with repentant self-abasement. Riddle's opinion that this is a "deliberate overstatement"[28] is applicable with justice. All parables are "deliberate overstatement" and are of the nature of a picture, not of a logical proposition. There is no indication that Jesus meant to classify <u>every</u> Pharisee as shallow and <u>every</u> Publican as humbly repentant.[29] (Lk 18:9-14)

(24) There is an instance here indicated wherein Jesus favored the strict interpretation of the School of Shammai in contradistinction to the more lenient one of Hillel's followers. (Mt 19:3-12 with Mk 10:2-12 and a fragmentary parallel from Luke 16:18) It is possible that Matthew reedits Mark's account, by inserting the phrase "trying him".[30] <u>Divorce</u>, with Shammai, was forbidden on all grounds but "fornication." It is hardly just to turn this question into a proof of antagonism on the part of "Pharisees". Standing by itself, the incident could not be conclusive. Mark does not here (vs. 11) even allow adultery as a basis for divorce. Jesus seemingly excluded divorce absolutely.

(25) The scene is laid in Jerusalem and in the account of the Triumphal Entry (Mt 21:1-11; Mk 11:1-11; Lk 19:29-44) we have the demand made by "some of the Pharisees from the Multitude" that the "Teacher rebuke" his disciples, for quoting before him ascriptions of praise. Luke here is the only one to mention Pharisees, and with no particular evidence of hatred. To be sure, the attitude is one of reproof, bordering upon suspicion, but it might be only the well meant admonition of a conservative Rabbi. There is little evidence here of Luke's supposed anti-Pharisaic proclivity.

(26) The various account of the Cleansing of the Temple (Mt 21:12-17; Mk 11:1519; Lk 19:45-48) make no mention of Pharisees. We are inclined to believe that, in this action, Jesus must have had the approbation of many sincere Pharisees. "Scribes", chief priests" and "principal men" are specifically mentioned. Jesus did only what the Mishna later supported; "they may not make it (the Temple) a short-cut." (Berechoth ix 8; T. Berech. vii 19) There is no Lukan evidence of antagonism from Pharisees. He does not immediately challenge the Pharisees, altho they later (Mt 21:45) start to oppose him. In Mt 21:23 and parallels, the "chief priests, scribes and elders" request of him a basis of authority for his actions. Abrahams calls this incident, "A healthy onslaught against externalism."[31] Such Pharisaic opposition as he may have aroused at this time was probably due to his assumption of authority, rather than to the act itself.

(27) The parables of the Two Sons (Mt 21:28-32) and of the Vineyard and the Husbandmen (Mt 21:33-36; Mk 12:1-12; Lk 20:9-19) are recognized, by the "chief priests and the Pharisees" (Mt 21:45, but by "the scribes and the chief priests" in Lk 20:19) as aimed at them. The charge is the legitimate one of externalism in religion, the ignorance of or abandonment of the essentially prophetic viewpoint. Any genuine prophet of religion would have done as Jesus did. There is nothing suspicious in this account.

(28) While Luke takes advantage of Markan or Petrine material in his account of the Tribute to Caesar incident, it is not with prejudice (Mt 22:15-22; Mk 12:13-17; Lk 20:20-26). Matthew has "Pharisees" and Mark, "certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians" while Luke has simply "and they sent forth spies,". There is in the latter account no advantage taken of the obvious opportunity to lay blame upon some Jewish party. The Herodians would naturally be the most interested in putting Jesus in the wrong. Mark in two other places links the Herodians and the Pharisees (3:6 & 8:15).

(29) With the question concerning the Great Commandment (Mt 22:34-40; Mk 12:28-34; Lk 20:39,40) there seems to be a period put to the attempts to discredit Jesus in public debate. Only Matthew mentions the Pharisees. Mark and Luke indicate scribes as responsible for the question, while Mark, alone, indicates the response of the sincere scribe, together with the commendation

of Jesus. Klausner considers this episode indicative of, "How far, even to the last, Jesus remained a true Pharisaic Jew--." Jesus is called "teacher"i.e., "Rabbi". The following comment from Klausner is worthy of perpetuation, "Jesus is thus still a Pharisee and he finds himself in agreement with a Scribe--Still more, the answer of Jesus is so like that of Hillel to would-be proselytes that it is difficult to suppose that only once and only casually did Jesus speak well of the Pharisees. The fact is that Jesus, more than once, stood on the side of the Pharisees, but the Evangelists (who flourished during the struggle between Christianity and Pharisaic Judaism) only preserved isolated passages in favor of the Pharisees, and (according to Chwolsohn) often changed "Scribes and Sadducees" to "Scribes and Pharisees", because, by the time of writing, the Sadducees were no longer important."[32] Also, "There are ethical sayings attributed to Jesus which recur word for word in Talmud or Midrash. (Sota i 7, Mt 7:2; Baba Bathre 15b and Arakhin 17b, Mt 7:3-5; Berakhoth 9b., Mt 6:38; Massekheth Kallah or Lev. R. 23, Mt 5:28; Nidda 13b., Mt 5:29-30 & 18:8,9; Baba Bathra 9b., Mt 6:3; etc.)"

In reference to the above arguments, we do not entirely sympathize with Chwolsohn, for it is impossible to prove that substitutions have or have not been made, and the positive assumption is only proven on the basis of a theory which may not be sufficient to substantiate it. The argument from silence, however, is well taken, and it can well be that Jesus found many occasions of commending both scribe and Pharisee that are

not indicated in Gospel account as we have it at present. At another place we shall deal with the "literature of defence" argument of anti-Pharisaic Gospel material

(30) The question of Jesus, What think ye of the Christ? whose son is he? David's? (Mt 22:41-46; Mk 12:35-37; Lk 20:41-44) may be put in this form: How could Jesus, a Galileean, be Messiah (i.e., Son of David)? "To evade this serious difficulty," says Klausner (ibid.), "Jesus must find a passage of Scripture according to which the Messiah need not necessarily be the Son of David, and like an expert Pharisee he finds it." (Ps 110 which is Messianic, infact, and Maccabean.) "That the Pharisees admitted the principle that the Messiah need not be the son of David only (though "Son of David" has become to be the regular title of the Messiah in the Talmud) is obvious from the fact that B. Kokhbah was accepted as Messiah by R. Akiba, in spite of the fact that it is nowhere claimed for B. Kokhbah that he was of the house of David."

We can at least say this much; there is strong presupposition that Matthew's account reflects anti-Pharisaic prejudice here. There seems no reason for the insertion on the Pharisees as the objects of Jesus' question, except, possibly, to balance the victory which, according to Matthew, he had just gained over the Sadducees in the question upon divorce. We would be inclined to bracket both verse 34 and verse 41 under this suspicion, but we have no means of verifying this suspicion beyond a doubt.

(31) The 23rd chapter of Matthew's Gospel, says Streeter,[33] is

like the Sermon on the Mount in being a long connected discourse of composite character. Both Matthew 23 and its parallel from Luke (20:45-47; and material from the 9th, 11th, 13th, & 14th chapters) cannot be referred to a single written source without great difficulty. Montefiore[34] asserts that "Tradition had added to the authentic words of Jesus even before they were recorded in Q, and Q itself was not, all of its short life, a fixed quantity." He thinks that we can never be sure how much or how little goes back to Jesus. It is his opinion that the account of Jesus' reputed attack upon the scribes and the Pharisees confuses the few very bad with the many indifferently good and with the few very good. Riddle, whom we have referred to frequently above, is in this place also worth our attention. It is his conviction that Matthew here, is "spokesman for a community in which the polemic here contained was doubtless common."[25] The location of this community was Antioch and the bitterness was due to persecution of Christian by Jew. It was not, says he, the attitude of Jesus but, rather, the result of competition between Christian and Jewish groups. He also asserts that the study of the spirit of Rabbinic Judaism makes it impossible to substantiate these charges. He thinks this to be the anti-Pharisaic basis of Matthew's Gospel at its height and affirms that Luke, who uses this material, does so without its original force.

Klausner, while pointing out the composite character of the account in Matthew as well as what he thinks is unfairness on the part of Jesus in making such a wide generalization, indicates that, "Much of this criticism was certainly justified.

The cleansing of vessels was a matter more serious than the shedding of blood." (Yoma 23a.; T. Yom Kippur I 12) "The Talmud, also,- speaks of "the plague of the Pharisees---who advise orphans to deprive the widow of her maintenance"."[36] As a matter of fact, the Psalms of Solomon, iv, indicate that the Pharisees themselves make the same attack on Sadducees. So, also, is the case in the Assumption of Moses, vii:6.

Our conclusions in respect of this long passage, the textual integrity of which is most difficult to ascertain, is that we have, here combined, many references from Jesus' mouth in criticism of Pharisees. We cannot ascribe their directness and force to prejudices within the Antioch community. We believe that the Gospels are authentic evidence of Pharisaic and scribal opposition to Jesus and his work and message. We do not conclude that Jesus shut all scribes and Pharisees under the condemnation, it was rather the tendency of their way of doing and thinking, a tendency which evidenced itself in many callous and brutal acts in the name of religion. Here, if anywhere, is place for suspicion that the narrative makes too general a condemnation, possibly under the sting of Jewish persecution.

(32) We shall now, in this and the immediately following sections, indicate briefly the identifications as to responsibility for Jesus' apprehension, trial and death, as indicated in the first three Gospels.

The passage, Mt 26:1-5, (Mk 14:1,2; Lk 22:1,2) indicates

that "the chief priests and the elders of the people" in the "court of the High Priest--Caiaphas" began the conspiracy. Mark has "the chief priests and the scribes", as does Luke also in the parallels.

(33) Judas is introduced in Matthew 26:14-16 as one who "went unto the chief priests" and proposed to deliver Jesus. Mark (14:10,11) also has the same, while Luke's account (22:3-6) mentions only "chief priests and captains", in collusion with Judas.

(34) The betrayal and arrest (Mt 26:47-56; Mk 14:43-52; Lk 22: 47-53) accounts specify "the chief priests and elders of the people", "the chief priests and the scribes and the elders", (and "a multitude") without characterization, respectively, as responsible for sending the "multitude". A "servant of the high priest" is indicated in all three accounts as receiving injury at the hands of some friend of Jesus.

(35) The trial of Jesus before the Jewish authorities indicates, "Caiaphas the high priest", "scribes and elders", "the officers", "the chief priests and the whole council" (Mt 26:57-75) as having to do with the proceedings, in the court or "the house" of the "high priest". Mark, whose narrative Matthew follows closely here, (14:53-72) has no variation in this respect. Luke, curiously enough, seems to supplement the narrative toward the latter end, while omitting the preliminary details. (22:57-71).

Substantially the same identifications are made, specifying "the assembly of the elders of the people".

(36) The trial before Pilate is indicated, by Matthew (27:1-31), as involving "all the chief priests and the elders of the people", "Pilate, the governor", "the chief priests and the elders", "the governor" and "the multitudes". Mark (15:1-20) indicates also "scribes" and "the whole council", and his account is not so full as that of Matthew. Luke (23:1-25) has only "the chief priests and the rulers" and "the rulers of the people".

(37) At the crucifixion of Jesus "the chief priests" with "the scribes and elders" mock him (Mt 27:32-56). Mark, whose account is a close parallel, indicates "chief priests" with "the scribes". (15:21-41) Luke, again seeming to supplement the account where Matthew and Mark lack certain details, (23:26-29) simply indicates "the rulers" as also scoffing him.

(38) Subsequent to the crucifixion, "the chief priests and the Pharisees" are mentioned by Matthew, as well as "the elders" (27:62 & 28:11,12) as securing a watch to guard the sepulchre, against a theft of Jesus' body by his disciples.

(39) Luke (24:20) refers to "the chief priests and our rulers" as responsible for Jesus' death.

Before introducing several pertinent comments from Klaus-

ner's excellent treatment of the above general subject of Jesus' condemnation and death, we would take opportunity to indicate our strong suspicion, from a study of the Synoptic Gospel accounts, that Pharisaic opposition to Jesus began to weaken, or at least be ashamed of itself, following the cleansing of the temple. They are not directly named as implicated in his betrayal and condemnation, altho this argument from silence can be overworked. It seems to us that this religiously earnest section of the Jewish public may quite reasonably have had to give some grudging admiration to a man who dared to do what many Pharisees must have approved. We would like to think that this is the meaning of the silence concerning them. Matthew's account of the request on the part of Pharisees for a guard over the tomb may very well be an echo of prejudice, as some critics are inclined to believe. (Note excellent summary of this last in NCHS NT pp.202-203.)

"We have already pointed out," says Klausner,[37] "the fact that in the time of Jesus, the temple and all local government was in the hands of the Sadduceean--Boethusean priests; hence "the chief of the priests and the Scribes and the elders' mentioned in the Gospels were, almost entirely, Sadducees." "The Sadducees as well as the Pharisees had their 'elders' and 'Scribes'; but since the 'Scribes' preceded the Tannaim, and since, when the Gospels were written, the Sadducees had lost power and importance, the Gospels use (in place of 'Priests-scribes') the terms 'Scribes and Pharisees' in the same breath, as though they were synonymous terms."

"The Pharisees, hitherto Jesus' main opponents, cease now to play a prominent part; their place is taken by the Sadducees and the priestly class whom Jesus had irritated by the "cleansing of the temple" and by his reply concerning the Law of Moses and the resurrection of the dead. The Pharisees objected to Jesus' behaviour--his disparagement of many ceremonial law, his contempt of the words of the "sages" and his consorting with publicans and ignorant folk and doubtful women. They considered his miracles sorcery and his messianic claims effrontery. Yet for all that, he was one of themselves: his convinced belief in the Day of Judgement and the resurrection of the dead, the messianic age and the kingdom of heaven, was a distinctively Pharisaic belief; he taught nothing which, by the rules of the Pharisees, rendered him criminally guilty." "The trial of Jesus was not in accordance with the spirit of the Pharisees--."

The author above quoted brings forth evidence here to prove that between the time of Jesus and that of the Mishna (Rabbi Yehuda ha-Nari) "there intervened 200 years and many great changes." He also indicates that "The Talmud hates them (high priests and their families) and regards them as enemies of the people, whom they "beat with their staves". In the sight of the Pharisees, thinks Klausner, Jesus was guilty of nothing more than "an impertinence against heaven". The Evangelists, however, are not explicit, and if they do not purposely make all the Jews responsible for the torture and death of Jesus, at least they do nothing to lift the responsibility

from the shoulders of the Pharisees.

We believe that this point of view is exceedingly significant. We shall deal with Riddle's main thesis here. He thinks that Matthew's account is anti-Pharisaic because of the situation in Antioch where the Gospel originated. He also asserts, in chapter five, etc., that Luke-Acts is a "literature of defence" by means of which the author attempted to clear the Romans of the guilt of killing Jesus, and in doing so Luke, he thinks, has been at much pains to lay the blame upon the Jews, particularly the Pharisees.

In criticism of these two points, we would say, first, that a rough computation shows that Luke omits identification of the Pharisees some twenty times where Matthew or Mark specify them, includes them some five times where they are included by Matthew and Mark, and introduces them specifically some fifteen times where they are not specified in Markan or Matthew parallels. This of course is not of supreme significance, but it is also true that Luke fails to identify Jesus' opponents where Matthew (particularly) and Mark do so. Secondly, it is a serious mistake to consider the Gospel literature one of defence. It is not, primarily, so much a literature of defence as of Witness. Everything was secondary to and subsidiary to the testimony which the Evangelists desired to bear. They were talking about what had happened to them, and the cause was the life and death and subsequent influence of Jesus. Both Pharisees and Sadducees, Jews and Romans, are figures in the background. The Gospels are not, primarily, a historical identification of

Jewish sects in Palestine. That is not their purpose. They are not "defensive", they are, rather "evangelical". They are not a thesis for or against Jew, Pharisee or Sadducee or scribe, nor against Roman or for him. No "defence" literature ever has the vitality that the Gospels have had to this day, and still have. They are akin to art, rather than to legal science. Riddle's psychological explanation does not account for the inherent life in them.

(40) We introduce here a brief table of the sections in St. John's Gospel where the Pharisees are referred to.

The Story of Nicodemus (3:1-12)

The Pharisees and baptizing by Jesus (4:1-3)

Chief priests and Pharisees linked together in the attempt to apprehend Jesus (7:32,45,47,48)

The Woman taken in adultery (8:3)

The Pharisees accuse Jesus of unsupported personal claims (8:13)

Jesus and the Blind Beggar of Jerusalem, he heals on the Sabbath (9:13-34)

The Pharisees resent Jesus' criticism of their spiritual sight (9:35-41)

The chief priests and Pharisees plot Jesus' death because his popularity, following the raising of Lazarus, threatens to destroy the intense spirit of nationalism fostered, supposedly, by the Pharisees (11:45-53,57; 12:19)

The Pharisees indicated as the mainspring of opposition to

Jesus. This evidences that the synagogue was closed to Jesus at this time. (12:42)

The chief priests and Pharisees linked together in seizure of Jesus in Gethsemane (18:3)

There seems to be little that the Fourth Gospel can add to the synoptics by way of aiding our study in this paper. The Pharisees are represented as participating in, in fact leading, opposition to Jesus. But they seem to us, largely if not entirely, included because they are one of the conspicuous parties or groups among the Jews. They are definitely implicated in the plot against Jesus' life and in his apprehension. We cannot draw from this Gospel much definite scientific indication as to how far all Pharisees were implicated. Jesus, we can see, did challenge their attitude toward the law and its interpretation, and he aroused their enmity. The raising of Lazarus is the occasion of the final assault against Jesus here, just as the cleansing of the temple is in the synoptics. The priests and the Sadducees are more concerned with the temple than are the Pharisees. The latter, being intense nationalists, are indicated as being aroused by the threat to Jewish integrity, but the logic of 11:48 is not clear to us today.

(41) The Pharisees are mentioned, subsequently, in Acts 23:6 as believing in the resurrection from the dead; 26:5 as being a strict sect of the Jews; Phil 3:5 as taking a definite stand toward the law; in Acts 15:5 where Christians, who were converted Pharisees had not abandoned all their Jewish ideas.

NOTES on C. RECORDS

1 JNK pp.264ff.

2 PH p.204.

3 SGM 1, p.42.

4 JPR pp.14ff.

5 JNK p.277-78; PH p.100.

6 JNK p.274.

7 ibid. p.178.

8 SPhA 2, p.197.

9 SGM 1, pp.86ff.

10 JPR p.9.

11 SGM 1, p.88; JPR p.9.

12 JNK pp.274-75.

13 SPhA 1, p. 23.

14 In the days of the Tannaim ('Teachers', the name given to the Jewish authorities living during the first two centuries of the Christian era. The famous Schools of Hillel and Shammai begin this line and R. Jehuda the Patriarch, great-grandson of Hillel, brings it to a close. They were generally called Rabbi.) the tradition remained, or had by this time developed, that Jesus had been put to death as a seducer, a beguiler. In their days Jesus' disciples had become a separate sect which denied many of the religious principles of Judaism: "Therefore their teacher, Jesus, had beguiled them and led them astray from the Jewish faith." See HDBV art. on Talmud, ext. vol. pp.57-66, S. Schechter. Also JNK p.28.

15 JNK pp.122,278.

16 SGM 1, p.91.

17 SPhA 1, p.134.

18 JNK ibid.

19 NCHS art. St. Luke, pt.III, p.218, C. Gore.

20 JNK p.279.

21 SGM 2, p.55; also pp. 478ff.

22 SPhA 1, pp.25, 98; JPR pp.130-31; JNK p.367.

23 NCHS art. St. Mark, pp.73-75, H.C. Turner: art. St. Matthew, pp.164-166, Levertoff and Goudge.

24 JNK p. 122.

25 SGM p.135.

26 Additional references, particularly strictures on the Gospel accounts, include JNK pp.289-90; SGM p.143; a comment supporting our conclusions is found in JBL pp.98-99, op.cit.

27 JPR p.35.

27b SPhA 2, p.189.

28 JPR pp.26-37.

29 SPhA 1, pp.57,124-125.

30 JPR pp.11,36; JNK p.374.

31 SPhA 1, p.88.

32 JNK pp.319-20;384.

33 FGS pp.253-54.

34 SGM pp.296-309.

35 JPR pp.138-141.

36 JNK pp.321-22.

37 JNK pp.334ff.

D. We shall indicate here, briefly, Definite Points of Opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees, as indicated from the foregoing study.

The scribes and Pharisees criticised Jesus for evidently setting aside the Mosaic Law, particularly in regard to the Sabbath and its sanctity.

He was criticised for failing to keep customary fasts.

He persisted in associating with people who were ceremonially unclean or, as we would put it today, morally under suspicion.

He evidently did not keep the scribal interpretations of the Law in respect. This is true in the matter of washings, etc.

Jesus made no pretence of approving scribal and Pharisaic opinions on religion. In fact, he openly criticised them, and with point and pungency as well as ridicule. That is to say, by explicit reference, as well as by inference from his actions, he opposed the Pharisees.

Jesus claimed to forgive sins; with the scribes and Pharisees this was a prerogative of God alone.

He also allowed people to make ascriptions of praise before him, which to the scribes and Pharisees savored of blasphemy.

His very presence in any situation evidently drew people's attention away from the avowed interpretors and teachers of religion and the Law to himself. This wounded the pride of the self-sufficient and caused them to become insignificant in their own opinion.

Finally, his acts of healing seemed to enrage them. This is hard to understand except on the supposition that he succeeded where they failed and so wounded their pride, or else, by healing he implicitly exposed their lack of sympathy, and so put religion in a new and generous light far more attractive than Pharisaic and scribal legalism.

E. SOLUTION of the Problem of the Conflict.

We shall consider the situation, first, from the uncritical point of view quite frequently given in explanation. Put in bald form, it is this: Jesus was the Son of God; the Pharisees, being evil and condemned in their own conscience as well as by his words, would not so accept him. In consequence of the rejection, Jesus was apprehended and crucified.

We are here in contact with a christology and a view of inspiration and revelation that has grown up and has become accepted in certain parts of the church after Jesus' time. It fails to take account of the truth that all revelation is conditioned by the moral and ethical nature of God and it also overlooks the fact that Jesus, to the people of his time, looked and behaved like a man, in fact, was a man in every essential.

When we take the various attributes of divinity, as incorporated into Christian theology, attributes taken largely from the dialectic of philosophy, and when we clamp these down upon a human figure *in toto*, the result is a monstrosity, it is something never real in heaven or earth, but in the fantastic mind of man. Jesus Christ is, by such a method of approach, finally removed from any possibility of human understanding and the Pharisees are but automatons.

The situation assumes another and quite different aspect when we begin with Jesus, not with philosophy, and when we try to understand God from what we know of Jesus' life and teaching and his power over the will and affections of men. In this light, the struggle between Jesus and the Pharisees is the cul-

mination of a drama exhibiting two forces in religion, the legalistic and literal as opposed to the ethical and prophetic.

The conflict was inevitable because the Pharisees were the religious people of their time. They endeavored to make religion a part and parcel of all human life, and they did this by expanding the written law by means of scribal interpretations as binding as was the original source. Jesus, on the other hand, while including all human experience under the scope of religion, trusted, not to external interpretation of any law of the letter, but to the moral and ethical in the experience of man, and to man's affections. His point of view is exhibited in the Parable of the Prodigal Son and is philosophized, by St. Paul, in the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. In Jesus the prophetic Jewish spark became incandescent, while in Pharisaism Jewish legalism became solidified. There was no middle ground. The Pharisees must either accept him, or they must eliminate him from the scene. We have proof of this nexus of conflict in the fact that it was the Pharisaic scribes who were first to suspect Jesus, and to offer him opposition in the Synagogue.

Jesus actually took the same liberty with the law as did the Pharisaic scribes: he enlarged upon it. But he would not be bound by their interpretations, for these, rather than making the law effective toward producing essential goodness of heart and will, actually forged a chain from the law, and hung it about the necks of the people. There were thus two interpretations, one was toward bondage, the other was toward life, self determined moral integrity and essential freedom.

In the first stages of the conflict, the Sadducees and their scribes had little interest. In the Synoptic Gospels the enmity between the Pharisees and Jesus is taken up by the Sadducees, who are offended by the threat Jesus made to their authority when he drove the abuses from the temple. It is, therefore, the Sadducees, not the Pharisees, who give the coup de grace. But in both events it turns upon Jesus' attitude toward holy things; with the Pharisees the law, with the Sadducees the sanctuary. It is a contest between life, on the one hand, and dead things on the other. Life against the dead letter and the dead place.

We are enabled to see plainly, therefore, that it was Jesus Himself who was the cause of the conflict. He was the source of a new vigor, a new hope, beside which the legalism of the scribe and the sacerdotalism of the Sadducee became shabby. Whatever else Jesus may have added to the sum total of true religion, the significant fact is that he added Himself. This is the solution of our problem of conflict. It lies within the mysterious depths of personality, human and divine. Jesus was the logical result of prophetic religion, a force within humanity which inevitably brings a crisis and allows of no middle ground. The religious leaders among the Jews of his time, of whom the Pharisees and their scribes were the most forceful and determined examples, must find place for him or they must reject him.

We have dealt at length with the form-history theory. This says, in substance, that the scriptures are not to be

trusted for historical data and that the motives of the writers can be examined by us of a later date and are subject to serious strictures. We hold, on the contrary, that the data regarding the Pharisees, as we have it in the New Testament are of prime historical importance. We have here an unstudied picture of the conflict which is the supreme tragedy of Judaism.

There is, however, a larger truth and a larger evidence from the form-history method of study. The Gospels as well as the New Testament as a whole, constitute a literature, not of defence but of witness. The prime concern of the writers was with the person of Jesus and with his influence upon people and events, particularly including themselves.

We believe that this study reveals the essential charge against the "Pharisaic scribes" to be just. They, because of their very determination, were examples of "hypocrisy", i.e., acting a part. We do not believe that this study reveals all Pharisees or all scribes to be hypocrites. Some were, however, and hypocrisy was the Pharisaic vice as worldliness was that of the Sadducees. The Zealots were characterized by proclivities toward violence. The Essenes evidently were quietists. The Herodians were politically minded. Just in this measure that the above characterizations are true we may aver that the Pharisees are revealed in their characteristic guise in the Gospels. This does not condemn every member of the party. It does impeach their method and their characteristic motive. We cannot affirm that Judaism of either New Testament or modern times is to be identified with Pharisaism.

The sincere Christian of our day cannot think of condoning pogroms against the Jews nor can he defend persecutions in the past. There is no need for Jew or Christian to defend the Pharisees and their scribes. Religion is inextricably interwoven into the texture of humanity and has caused much good and much ill. An honest examination of history, if it is to be valuable to us, must be larger than racial and religious animosities inherited from the past.

F. BIBLIOGRAPHY

SPhA "Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels", I. Abrahams, Cambridge, University press, 1917 (2nd series, 1924).

"The Teaching of Jesus", Burton, Chicago, University of Chicago press (1923).

APC "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Ot", R.H. Charles, Oxford, Clarendon press, 1913.

PH "The Pharisees", R.T. Herford, London, Allen & Unwin, 1924.

"Pharisaism", R.T. Herford, N.Y., G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

JAJ "Antiquities of the Jews", Flavius Josephus, Whiston's translation, Philadelphia, D. McKay.

JWJ "Wars of the Jews", Flavius Josephus, Whiston's translation, Philadelphia, D. McKay.

LJ "Life of Josephus", Flavius Josephus, Whiston's translation, Philadelphia, D. McKay.

JNK "Jesus of Nazareth", Klausner, N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1925.

OSCK "The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church", K. Kohler, The Macmillan Co., 1929.

JPL "Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ", J.W. Lightley, London, Epworth press, 1925.

"The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content", T.W. Manson.

"The Historic Jesus", MacKinnon, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1931.

"New Testament Times in Palestine", Shailer Matthews, New and Revised Edition, 1933.

SGM "The Synoptic Gospels", C. Montefiori, London, Macmillan and Co., 1909.

JM "Judaism", G.F. Moore, Cambridge, Harvard University press, 1927.

"The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age", Th. Walker, N.Y., Doran, 1923.

"A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels", Burton & Goodspeed, Scribners, N.Y., 1917, 1929.

"Records of the Life of Jesus", (Harmony) N.Y., Associapress, 1917.

"The Greek Testament", (Nestle) Revell, New York.

"The Holy Bible" (Moffatt), also American Revision.

"New Edition of the Babylonian Talmud", Rodkinson & Wise, 1916.

JPR "Jesus and the Pharisees", D.W. Riddle, Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1928.

"Preparing the Way", F. Streatfield, London, Macmillan & Co., 1925.

HJPS "History of the Jewish People", E. Schurer, 2nd and revised edition, N.Y., Scribners, 1891.

FGS "The Four Gospels", B.H. Streeter, N.Y., Macmillan Co.,1925.

"Sayings of the Jewish Fathers", C. Taylor, Cambridge, University press, 1897.

TAT "Talmud and Apocrypha", R.T. Herford, Soncino press, 1933.

NCHS "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha", Gore and others, N.Y., Macmillan, 1928.
Art. St. Luke, pt.III, p.218, C. Gore.
" St. Mark, pt. III, p.73-75, H.C. Turner.
" St. Matthew, pt.III, pp.164-166, Levertoff & Goudge.

ABC "Abingdon Bible Commentary" Eiselen and others, Abingdon press, N.Y., 1929.
Art. "The Literature of the Intertestmental Period", L.E. Fuller, p.198.

HDB "Hastings Dictionary of the Bible", Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1909.
Art. "The Pharisees", H.S. Nash, pp.719-720.

ERE "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics", Hastings, 12 vols., N.Y., Scribners, 1908-22.
vol. ix, pp.831-836, art. "Pharisees", G.H. Box.

DCG "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels", Hastings, 2 vols. N.Y., Scribners, 1906-08.
vol.2, pp.351ff., art. "Pharisees".

JE "The Jewish Encyclopedia", N.Y. Funk & Wagnals Co., 12 vols., 1907.
vol. ix, pp.661-666, art. "Pharisees", K. Kohler.
vol. xii, art. "Talmud and Torah", J.D. Eisenstein.

EB "The Encyclopaedia Biblica", N.Y., Macmillan Co., 4 vols. 1899.
vol. iv, art. "Scribes and Pharisees", J.D. Prince, cols. 4321-4329.

JBL "The Journal of Biblical Literature", vol. 48, pp.1-115, art. "Primitive Christianity and Judaism: A Symposium", F.C. Porter, S.S. Cohon and others.
Art. "Jesus' Attitude to the Law of Moses", vol. 47, pt. 1-2, pp.32-40.
Art. "Jesus and the Law: A Study of the Book of Matthew", ibid. pp. 203-31.

JR "The Journal of Religion", art. "Judaism in New Testament Times", Jan. '28.

HTR "Harvard Theological Review", art. "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy", L. Finkelstein, vol.22, pp. 185-261, July '29.
Art. "The Problem of Jesus", M. Goguel, vol.23, pp.93-120, April '30.

BS "Biblothaeca Sacra", art. "Study of the Definitive Causes of the Death of the Lord Jesus Christ", N.W. Sharpe, vol. 87, pp.423-452, Oct. '32.

HDBV "Hastings Dictionary of the Bible", five volume edition, Scribeners,N.Y., 1908.
Art. on "Talmud", ext. vol. pp.57-66, S. Schechter.

GTU Library
3 2400 00670 9210

LIBRARY USE ONLY